

APPENDIX “C”

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

	City/County	Elected Officials	Influencers	Education	Environmental	Information Provider	Utility/Public Service
Data Sources, Adequacy and Needs (Question #1)	<p>Sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Internal staff information and data collection (xxxx)</li><li>Chapman U. Economic Forecasting (x)</li><li>Information from public and private partners, including OC Fire Authority, water districts, school districts, private service providers, the County (xx)</li><li>CSUF real estate trends (x)</li><li>UCI Executive Survey</li><li>Internal computer models to project financial impacts of development</li><li>State and federal governments</li></ul> <p>Reliability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Own data highly reliable (xx)</li><li>Data consistent across sources</li><li>Generally reliable (x)</li><li>Some information (e.g. RHNA) grossly unreliable + SCAG data highly suspect (xx)</li><li>Hard to know if adequate</li><li>Lack of credible data (conflict between school district &amp; developer projections)</li></ul> <p>Future Data Needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Citizen opinion/citizen engagement</li><li>Citizen education re: issues</li><li>No - Council didn't want survey in past</li><li>Could use more data, but could be overload</li><li>Data integration difficult</li></ul>	<p>Sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>In-house data assembled by City staff (xxxx)</li><li>Whatever information we can obtain</li><li>League of Cities (x)</li><li>OCCOG data contract</li><li>Special districts, OCTA</li><li>State sources</li><li>SCAG</li><li>Surveys on citizen needs</li><li>Consultant for financial analysis</li></ul> <p>Reliability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Data are reliable/Mostly reliable (xxx)</li><li>High confidence in SCAG numbers – cross-reference data from multiple sources</li><li>Depends on the source – advocate (e.g. Toll Authority) can't be trusted</li></ul> <p>Future Data Needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Data to help with issues that are difficult because of “political correctness” (e.g. immigration)</li><li>Data to help fix causes of the problems (e.g. transportation congestion, water quality)</li><li>More data on regional impacts such as traffic and housing</li></ul>	<p>Sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>They rely on “primary research” – the raw source, not interpreted data. Some is from government sources and some from Meyers Group data and similar entities.</li><li>Many interviewees have their own research department. They look at what is actually happening instead of relying on SCAG/Department of Finance figures which some believe are less reliable.</li><li>Land developers look at who provides the services locally and how the agencies, districts etc will serve their projects.</li><li>They also try to determine the agencies' capabilities and requirements. Are they specific enough? What are their policies, fiscal requirements etc?</li><li>Basically, they do studies similar to an MSR – then decide what they need to do vs. what an agency can do.</li><li>They were all comfortable with the data that they use.</li></ul>	<p>Sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>For financial, facility and curriculum decisions: Orange County Department of Education, city and data generated in-house (xx)</li><li>Professional organizations information (xx)</li><li>Track legislation on new service mandates and state budget for educations</li><li>Development community projections</li><li>Demographic software used to project enrollment</li><li>Software package from Northridge Community College District</li><li>Chapman University projections for County</li><li>Workforce Investment Board data on jobs</li><li>Customer input: peer group dialogues</li></ul> <p>Reliability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Technological sophistication leads to better but not terrific data</li><li>In-house data reliable but time-intensive</li><li>Enrollment projections accurate</li><li>Self-reported developer data have limitations</li><li>Developer information is optimistic</li><li>Private sector information on employment projections valuable but proprietary</li></ul> <p>Future Data Needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Demographic changes increase data needs</li><li>More shared information from a variety of perspectives to better inform about consequences of decisions</li></ul>	<p>Sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>U.S. Forest Service</li><li>Newspapers</li><li>Internal data collection</li><li>Too much reliance on SCAG</li></ul> <p>Reliability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>SCAG data inaccurate, focus on continuation of current trends</li></ul> <p>Future Data Needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>“Guide Book” for people seeking public policy information on the Internet (website devoted to open space)</li><li>Projections that allow for choice and alternative scenarios</li></ul>	<p>Sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Orange County Community Indicators Report</li><li>Hospitals</li><li>Own polls and surveys with Advisory Board oversight</li><li>Secondary data from County</li></ul> <p>Reliability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Very reliable</li><li>Our data are extremely reliable</li><li>All secondary data from State is 2 years old</li></ul> <p>Future Data Needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>County needs better data mapping from school and hospital data, not just land use data</li><li>Immigration Coalition data</li></ul>	<p>Sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>In-house monitoring (xxxxx)</li><li>Cal State Fullerton demographics studies (xxxx)</li><li>Constituents (xx)</li><li>LAFCO-Proposed Incorporations (xx)</li><li>Chapman University's projections (x)</li><li>Cities (x)</li><li>Caltrans</li><li>Department of Finance</li><li>Department of Justice</li><li>Developers</li><li>Internet</li><li>League of Public Works</li><li>MWD Water Supply Data</li><li>Planning agencies</li><li>SAPA Projections</li><li>SCAG Population Data</li><li>State Controller's Projections</li><li>Water Quality Rules &amp; Regulations</li></ul> <p>Reliability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Accurate enough for our purposes (x)</li><li>Very reliable (x)</li><li>None are really reliable</li></ul> <p>Future Data Needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Land use data</li><li>Right-of-Way information</li></ul>

	City/County	Elected Officials	Influencers	Education	Environmental	Information Provider	Utility/Public Service
Challenges for Local Agencies (Questions 2, 3, 5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• State financial threats/local fiscal solvency (xxxxx)</li><li>• Transportation (xx)</li><li>• Expiration of Measure M</li><li>• Aging infrastructure (x): sewers</li><li>• Infrastructure “expiring” all at once a future problem for newer cities</li><li>• Non-elected regulatory boards</li><li>• Urban runoff (xx)</li><li>• Water/groundwater replenishment</li><li>• Water supply (future)</li><li>• Running out of developable land</li><li>• Legislative and regulatory mandates erode local flexibility and discretion: labor regulations, stormwater regulations, PERS/retirement</li><li>• Inconsistency of regulatory requirements with city size</li><li>• Conflicting regulations and standards: State, District, local ordinances</li><li>• Financial exposure from control agency requirements (WRCB, SWRCB, EPA)</li><li>• Jobs/housing balance</li><li>• Social services</li><li>• In-fill housing – challenge of requirements for small parcels and citizen acceptance</li><li>• Tax structure favors commercial over residential</li><li>• Public understanding of costs of providing services (xx)</li><li>• Union opposition to solutions such as service regionalization</li><li>• Future costs of police and fire services</li><li>• Shoreline protection</li><li>• State attempts to take over the parole system</li><li>• Maintaining local high quality</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Transportation (xxx)</li><li>• The 91 freeway – variability of County efforts among LA, Orange and Riverside</li><li>• Growth in back country</li><li>• Fiscal challenges out of Sacramento (xx)</li><li>• Increasing demands on cities without funding/unfunded mandates (urban runoff) (xx)</li><li>• Shift of responsibilities from State to local without resources</li><li>• Education</li><li>• Lack of high schools</li><li>• Housing (x)</li><li>• Achieving linkage between users of service and payment for services</li><li>• Hillside development, especially unincorporated – County standards are lax</li><li>• Aging infrastructure and lack of downstream coordination</li><li>• Increased demand for infrastructure</li><li>• Accessibility to and delivery of water (x)</li><li>• Environmental impact of growth (congestion, trucking to development)</li><li>• Tourism and visitors – enhancing OC image</li></ul> <p>For others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Orange County Planning Commission ineffectiveness</li></ul> <p>Plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Transportation: tunnel thru mountains, Foothill freeway completion, 71 freeway extension.</li><li>• Favor public transit extension to airport.</li><li>• Doubtful about light rail</li><li>• Lack of regional approach to transportation and service delivery</li></ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Housing plans challenged by fiscal uncertainty.</li><li>• Housing stock perceived as</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• All felt there were significant challenges with growth and infrastructure.</li><li>• The Influencers, especially land developers, felt that one of the biggest challenges is political. Biggest challenge will be 1) availability of land for homebuilding 2) getting through entitlements on a major land development project. Agencies need to plan for growth, yet are under heavy pressure from their constituents (residents) to resist growth and impede or even stop growth.</li><li>• Cost and availability of water.</li><li>• Improving the images of some of the older cities.</li><li>• State and city budget crisis</li><li>• Regionalism Concept: Some past regional efforts have been dismal, like Coastal Commission. But to solve a lot of the major issues such as transportation we need a regional approach. However, severe reservations because this could open “Pandora’s box” where entities like Coastal Commission abuse their power.</li><li>• All felt that most of the service challenges were not being adequately planned for.</li><li>• They felt there was a need for political leaders with a better sense of civic responsibility to the region as a whole, because many of these issues are regional in nature and each city and agency is part of the over-all region.</li><li>• The system breeds mediocrity. Term limits create short-term knowledge and short-term focus/solutions. They do the “right” things to avoid political fallout. Instead, they need to plan for growth even though residents don’t want it.</li><li>• Supervisor Wilson seems to be making the most enlightened effort.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Long-term planning</li><li>• Growth and development in South County</li><li>• Impact of declining enrollments on budgets</li><li>• Lack of reliable funding sources/State budget crisis (xxx)</li><li>• Increasing mandates and requirements without additional funding</li><li>• Impact of mandates on dropout rates and special needs students</li><li>• State dependency</li><li>• Keeping up with and affording changing technology and requirements</li><li>• Medical care required for special needs students</li><li>• Outreach to multiple cultures and schedules</li><li>• Projecting student and family needs</li><li>• Tensions caused by increasing diversity</li><li>• Environmental reviews for new school facilities/anti-growth sentiment in South County</li><li>• Public vs. private education quality debate</li><li>• Maintaining property “set asides” for school sites against pressure from development</li><li>• Scarcity of properties for facilities/lack of raw open land (xx)</li></ul> <p>For Others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Growth in employers with minimum-wage jobs</li><li>• Maintaining a qualified workforce</li><li>• Cost of clean water, air quality and seismic mandates (on both education and localities)</li><li>• Neighborhood neglect resulting from focus on commercial development/revenue generation</li><li>• Infrastructure growth</li><li>• Nature of financing/budget crises drive development decisions</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Preservation of open space in light of development and potential revenue generation</li><li>• General Plan used as holding pattern for development vs. proactive process</li><li>• Lack of funding to preserve open space</li><li>• Getting growth compatible with creation of compact, vibrant communities</li></ul> <p>Others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Water supply/availability</li><li>• Paving/runoff exacerbates lack of availability</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• New development without health and human services infrastructure – set asides for parks and schools but not health</li><li>• Lack of money</li><li>• Fiscalization of revenue sources</li><li>• City and school boundaries not meaningful except in areas such as Brea</li><li>• Need for joint use facilities – more common in South County</li><li>• Question doesn’t relate to us</li></ul> <p>For Others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Housing crisis -- No handle on the overcrowding of housing</li><li>• Housing costs</li><li>• State shift of responsibility to localities without additional funding</li><li>• State cuts programs that could help agencies weather funding crises (e.g. Application Assistors)</li><li>• Lack of sustainable, long-term-oriented development due to increased out-of-town interests</li><li>• Demand for educational facilities and health services given Orange County’s growth in child population (2<sup>nd</sup> largest child population in the State)</li><li>• Proliferation of service industry jobs with low wages (tied to lack of educational opportunities)</li><li>• Policy of business involvement as a solution yet business doesn’t really want to get involved (turnover, profit motive of post-Enron corporations)</li></ul>	<p><b>Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Growing population (x)</li><li>• Growth in Riverside County</li></ul> <p><b>Planning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Lack of long term planning within agencies (xx)</li><li>• Infrastructure (x)</li><li>• Transportation (xx)</li><li>• Lack of regional rail - local rail, bus service and parking to support this (x)</li><li>• Access to downtown LA (I-5 Freeway)</li><li>• Water supply for future growth</li><li>• Water quality</li><li>• Air quality</li><li>• Schools</li><li>• Waste management (bio solids, grease, emergency response times for sewer spills)</li><li>• Keeping current with technology</li><li>• Safety</li><li>• Domestic terrorism - Community doesn’t understand the seriousness so no measures have been taken to protect infrastructure, schools, government facilities, etc.</li><li>• Healthcare cuts</li><li>• Insurance and liability pooling</li></ul> <p><b>Funding</b> (xxxx)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• State Deficit-state will try to take away local money (x)</li><li>• Urban core produces more demand, but urban fringe produces more revenue.</li><li>• Need more sales tax revenue</li><li>• Large overhead costs paid to others</li><li>• Reduction in local government resources</li></ul> <p><b>Regulations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Meeting increased regulations (xxx)</li><li>• Requested annexations</li><li>• “No money, no mandates”</li></ul>

	City/County	Elected Officials	Influencers	Education	Environmental	Information Provider	Utility/Public Service
		<p>financial drain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• More mixed use, infill needed – strip malls into vibrant mixed-use developments</li><li>• More coordination needed on housing – built-out cities taking greater share</li></ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Education bureaucracy a barrier to changes - parents need more choices</li><li>• Consider user fees and rely on market mechanisms to control demand. Look at cost centers and control factors driving costs</li><li>• Building up reserves</li><li>• Passed tax to deal with runoff</li><li>• League pushing for constitutional protection of property taxes</li></ul> <p>Effectiveness?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Some proactive, others not</li><li>• Freeway system upgrades done well, especially I-5</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proper planning probably can't be achieved without major fiscal reform. Many organizations such as ULI &amp; SANDAG have raised these issues. For example: re-allocate property taxes to cities so that they are not so dependent on sales tax and have a better balance-less bias against residential and less bias in favor of commercial.</li><li>• Huntington Beach and Costa Mesa - Banning street extension needs to happen for good regional planning.</li><li>• (xx) Local: City of Newport Beach's "Green Light Initiative" - There is major growth all around the city's borders and they are foregoing good growth planning by pretending to live in a bubble. They won't increase their capacity for traffic, thus chopping off growth around them, although in many cases the politicians' hands are tied.</li><li>• They are pressured to create lower-end housing.</li><li>• Government entities run out of money and can't afford to maintain what they've required the developers to build.</li><li>• Measure "M" was a good example of regional leadership.</li><li>• Aging infrastructure is a very big issue because it is difficult to finance the replacement of aging infrastructure.</li><li>• (xxxx) Big challenge is also the conflicting interests between environmentalists and people wanting housing.</li><li>• (xxxx) All interviewees felt that the challenges on local agencies were not being adequately planned for.</li></ul>				<p><b>Coordination</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Information sharing at the regional level (x)</li><li>• Lack of collaboration</li><li>• Opposition to forming regional partnerships</li></ul> <p><b>Leadership</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Term limits (state) (x)<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- extensive water knowledge will be termed out shortly creating a lack of expertise.</li><li>- elected officials don't focus on long term efforts because there will be no noticeable result while in office.</li></ul></li></ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Public support/involvement on regional and local issues(xx)</li></ul>
<b>Most Frustrating Challenges</b> (Question 12)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Lack of reliable funding source beyond sales tax (xxx)</li><li>• Local fiscal crisis impacts momentum and programs</li><li>• Term limits impede long-term planning (x)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Lack of funding (x)</li><li>• Nothing – challenges are manageable</li><li>• Fiscal crisis an opportunity to create partnerships/force cooperation</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The most frustrating challenges for the influencers were lack of leadership amongst gov't leaders, local politics, trying to get multiple jurisdictions to agree on something, and dealing with</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• State funding and control/lack of local control (xx)</li><li>• Lack of trust from State legislators in local fiscal accountability</li><li>• Inability to target programs to</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Community opposition to double-tracking line for high-speed rail vs. inability to go inland – joint solution with cities/communities needed</li><li>• No real planning in Orange</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Lack of innovation and risk-taking by communities</li><li>• Reliance on funding programs rather than organization and capacity building (for example, through joint use of facilities)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Lack of strategic planning process for regions</li><li>• Public policy is generated around emotions instead of technical logic. (x)</li><li>• Public's lack of knowledge</li></ul>

	City/County	Elected Officials	Influencers	Education	Environmental	Information Provider	Utility/Public Service
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Legislative erosion of local decision-making</li><li>• Mandates by water board and labor board</li><li>• Conflicting regulations</li><li>• County Planning Department undermines local control/accomplishments</li><li>• “Rampant NIMBYism” in South OC</li><li>• Development of formerly preserved right-of-ways</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• State raids on reserves – defeat long-term planning</li><li>• Guessing what the State wants local governments to do re: compliance with regulations</li><li>• Challenge of dealing with State issues</li><li>• Lack of City involvement in defining future of SOI areas</li><li>• County reliance on developer information and needs</li><li>• Time it takes to get things done – although time is sometimes good</li><li>• Multiple layers of government involvement</li></ul>	<p>urban run-off.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The lack of coherent vision for the county, the integration of agencies and the duplication of effort. Money generated in southern California goes to northern California. Money in OC should stay in OC.</li></ul>	<p>local needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Lack of involvement in land use decisions and SOI discussions</li><li>• Lack of inclusion of all perspectives in decisions</li><li>• Abandonment of deeded sites for schools</li><li>• Poor transportation and access planning</li><li>• Lack of community acceptance of new schools</li><li>• Lack of vision from Board of Supervisors and other community leaders</li></ul>	<p>County – land use applicant-driven</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Piecemeal planning with reaction rather than choice</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• NIMBYism. Sometimes organizations need our data to fight the NIMBY mentality. e.g. Huntington Beach resident arguments that bringing Wal-Mart in will bring in “those” people</li><li>• Ignorance of what is really going on and what is the impact: e.g. societal benefit of providing health care for kids of immigrant parents.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Needs of politicians are so different than the needs of the agencies.</li><li>• Inability of MWDOC to make deals happen</li><li>• Number of players we have to deal with on each issue.</li><li>• Well-run agencies do not want to take over “bad” agencies due to negative media attention, fines, etc. They should be willing to take necessary steps to ensure things are run the best they can be.</li><li>• Funding (xx)<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-no correlation between where tax revenue is generated and where service demands are the greatest.</li></ul></li><li>• Regulations</li></ul>
<b>Regional Challenges</b> (Question 4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Water quality (xx)</li><li>• Transportation (xxx)</li><li>• Jobs/housing balance (x)</li><li>• Affordable housing (x)</li><li>• Public understanding of need for behavioral changes</li><li>• Changing demographics in OC</li><li>• Intercity coordination in Northern Orange County</li><li>• Lack of “fair share” in tax allocations from State</li><li>• Increasing cost of services (health care/worker’s comp)</li><li>• Number of contiguous special districts and duplication of services</li><li>• Need for subregional governance as an alternative to SCAG</li><li>• Regulatory challenges</li><li>• Maintaining/enhancing OC’s attractiveness as a destination</li><li>• Schools</li><li>• Sanitation (x)</li><li>• Aging infrastructure</li><li>• Air Quality</li><li>• Economic Development</li><li>• Open Space</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Transportation (x)</li><li>• Housing (x)</li><li>• Jobs/Housing balance – deal with congestion at the source</li><li>• Education</li><li>• Health care with aging population</li><li>• Recognizing public responsibility for health care</li><li>• Access to water</li><li>• Air quality</li><li>• County cohesiveness</li><li>• Inability to coordinate decreases ability to have strong voice in issues, especially with L.A. County</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The primary regional challenges included: Impacts from continuing growth – especially traffic and housing shortages, jobs to housing balance, affordability of housing, and coordination between agencies.</li><li>• All felt there was a strong need for agencies to coordinate with their neighbors on regional issues, and that decisions needed to be made, not just talk.</li><li>• Wide range of answers on how agencies could do this. They all thought that there was not a county agency that had the true leadership, nor the “teeth to make things happen.” Need to put stronger leaders in place. Transportation and major infrastructure issues should be handled regionally and local issues should be handled locally.</li><li>• Too many small cities that don’t have the critical mass to be financially self-sufficient.</li><li>• We would need to change their (politicians/leaders’) motivation, tear down the fiefdoms, and create political rewards for cooperation between agencies.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Lack of affordable housing</li><li>• Financing and financial stability</li><li>• Growth in minimum-wage jobs</li><li>• Maintaining a qualified workforce</li><li>• Jobs/housing balance</li><li>• Inability of County to attract new businesses, especially manufacturers, due to housing costs</li><li>• Quality of life vs. development – happy medium</li><li>• Development implications for water supply</li><li>• Regional challenges on the transportation network, including school trips</li><li>• Inadequate transportation and water infrastructure</li><li>• Lack of facility sites near development and gated communities exacerbate transportation problems</li><li>• Inadequate space for schools and libraries</li><li>• Turf issues – but improving with business, probation, parks and recreation</li><li>• Need to integrate health, probation, law enforcement and schools programs</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Lack of policies that preserve open space</li><li>• Board of supervisors don’t abide by buffer/preservation plans</li><li>• Lack of regional funding for transportation and open space – developments and homeowners need to pay in</li><li>• Preserving open space for wildlife, rural areas, farm areas and working landscape</li><li>• Transportation: lack of solutions/toll roads can’t solve the problem</li><li>• Lack of jobs/housing balance with Riverside County</li><li>• Revenue systems that favor commercial development over housing</li><li>• Lack of incentives for infill development/housing variety</li><li>• Education and schools losing out to war effort funding</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Challenges that go beyond city boundaries such as watersheds and air quality</li><li>• Economic partnership opportunities with San Diego County</li><li>• Opportunities for interagency collaboration</li><li>• Cuts to already-lean budgets (as in post-bankruptcy Orange County) leave little room for further cuts</li><li>• Challenge of service provision in times of budget cuts</li><li>• Territoriality of non-profit organizations limits necessary cooperation</li><li>• Lack of long-term vision for the County as a whole</li><li>• Other (neighboring) counties could follow Orange County’s model of integration but there is too much infighting in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties. L.A. has some data sharing but does it subregionally.</li></ul>	<p><b>Planning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Water reliability &amp; supply (xx)</li><li>• No long term planning in most agencies.</li><li>• Housing</li><li>• Rapid change in socio-demographics</li><li>• Infrastructure deterioration</li><li>• Medical care-trauma centers</li><li>• Aging population</li></ul> <p><b>Funding</b> (xxx)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Agency Boards not willing to raise taxes</li><li>• Contract cities have the lowest law enforcement costs</li><li>• O.C. is a “Donor County” \$.06 on the property dollar is returning to O.C. SF gets \$.65 of every property tax dollar.</li></ul> <p><b>Coordination</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Cooperation between counties (xx)</li><li>• Local governments need to coordinate on regional/sub-regional basis.</li><li>• Collaboration will produce the same results as consolidation.</li><li>• Large number of cities within</li></ul>

	City/County	Elected Officials	Influencers	Education	Environmental	Information Provider	Utility/Public Service
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Affordable housing</li></ul>			<p>the county makes collaboration difficult</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>No forum for discussions</li><li>Duplication of services</li><li>Decrease levels of government and have regional direction for regional issues</li></ul> <p><b>Transportation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Transportation (xxx)</li><li>Major portion of OC's workforce travels into the county due to high housing/rental costs.</li></ul> <p><b>Leadership</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Political leadership continuity and turnover</li><li>Lack of strong County leadership</li></ul>
<b>Assistance from Others: Local Challenges</b> (Question 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Understanding and explanation of interrelationships and interdependencies: housing, transportation, recruiting qualified workforce</li><li>Take further advantage of Measure M Growth Management Area provisions</li><li>Get special districts participating in joint forums/solutions</li><li>Coordination and cooperation on joint/consolidated services (street sweeping, parks maintenance)</li><li>County get out of the way</li><li>Eliminate OC Planning Department</li><li>County stop providing municipal services</li><li>Stabilize state financial situation/demands on local agencies</li><li>Orange County cities work well together</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Holistic rather than parochial approach – more cooperation</li><li>Increased role of LAFCO as broker between cities and County</li><li>County government take the long view, go beyond politics</li><li>Follow positive steps being taking on transportation</li><li>Cost reduction in fire and police (large amount of general fund goes toward police) (xx)</li><li>Increase local representation on sheriff cost decisions</li><li>Free up funds used to backfill state budget shortfalls</li><li>State leave cities alone to deal with local issues locally.</li><li>Funding stability to keep services for youth and seniors</li><li>Avoid issuing unfunded mandates</li><li>Provide information on what works, where it works, costs – a menu of options for urban runoff/water quality</li><li>Structure so that agencies/boards are more representative: population weighting</li><li>Help from Caltrans on the “details” – trash cleanup, freeway improvement communications</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Service awareness education by law enforcement and health</li><li>Partnership with schools on service awareness for law enforcement and health</li><li>N/A for Influencers</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Involve school districts early on in land use decisions</li><li>View schools as a community asset</li><li>Collaboration has increased with services to kids: health, courts, social services, probation, sheriff.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Abide by affordable housing standards</li><li>Prevent ranchette or estate lot subdivisions</li><li>Get rid of minimum lot sizes that prevent sufficient densities</li><li>Enforce current requirements on all developers, including water availability</li><li>(Riverside and Orange County) find funding to buy 24,000 acres of private land in the heart of the Santa Ana Mountains</li><li>Urban growth limits and urban service boundaries that are respected for the next 20 years</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Increase facility sharing between cities and schools</li><li>Open up untraditional facilities such as water district offices for outside meetings</li><li>Lack of agency coordination limits access to data – what resources are out there?</li><li>Having people know our resources exist</li><li>Need a place where information and data on everything that is going on is available</li><li>Need for information sharing</li><li>Communications with other organizations</li><li>Collaborate and share information and data</li><li>Develop areas of specialty rather than compete with and duplicate each other</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Communication, education and support between agencies (xxxxxx)</li><li>Need to take a regional view of projects instead of a parochial view (xx)</li><li>Urban water run-off</li><li>Control growth along bordering areas</li></ul>

	City/County	Elected Officials	Influencers	Education	Environmental	Information Provider	Utility/Public Service
Assistance from Others: Regional Challenges (Question 7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LAFCO doing a good job at visualizing growth</li><li>• LAFCO lobby state and federal agencies to stay off cities' backs</li><li>• LAFCO minimize new County islands</li><li>• LAFCO facilitate cross-jurisdictional discussions (xxx)</li><li>• Build on League, COG, GMA and other joint problem-solving efforts</li><li>• Cities and agencies work more in unison – League of Cities do better job of bringing cities together</li><li>• More openness to joint facility use by special districts</li><li>• LAFCO issue white papers to inform policymakers</li><li>• Careful, measured approach by LAFCO</li><li>• Broader view and participation in joint problem-solving by special districts</li><li>• Mandates on development communities for affordable housing</li><li>• Increase flexibility: redevelopment credit exchange</li><li>• Board of Supervisors regional facilitation</li><li>• Decrease regulatory burdens and attendant funding requirements</li><li>• LAFCO consolidate some of the water districts</li><li>• Water and sewer agencies apply knowledge/skills to urban runoff treatment and public education</li><li>• Regionalize fire services</li><li>• Consolidate water districts</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Moving toward more joint powers authorities as means of regional cooperation. Issue: takes voters out of the picture. More directly elected reps needed.</li><li>• Increased focus on product delivery for limited resources (transportation, water, sewage) More dominant regional service providers (such as Orange County Fire Authority)</li><li>• Special districts join together with each other or cities for joint purchases – e.g. water</li><li>• LAFCO increase emphasis on SOI, integrating into community strategic planning</li><li>• LAFCO advocate/be proactive on efficient government structure (fewer small cities)</li><li>• Give city a seat at table on SOI</li><li>• Increased state leadership, providing incentives for sensible land use decisions/mix of uses</li><li>• Agencies proactive on the cause of the problem, not just the fix</li><li>• Consistent, fair enforcement</li><li>• Decrease unfunded mandates</li><li>• Increase interagency communications</li><li>• County increase interaction with cities</li><li>• Increase focus on OCOG as convener/facilitator of discussions</li><li>• Improve understanding among elected officials of benefits of talking regionally</li><li>• LAFCO become broker fro cross-border issues</li><li>• Establish OCOG as more of a regional forum</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Cities: need a balance between local control and their parochial natures, which tends to keep them looking only within their own border. Difficult for them because they are in office for short term and difficult to make long term decisions. <b>Possibly create political rewards for cooperation between agencies.</b> Need to identify common denominators to help enable dialogue and solutions between agencies.</li><li>• Counties: Use their long expertise at regional planning. Make them take care of regional infrastructure decisions and have the final say instead of the city.</li><li>• LAFCO: Play stronger mediation role. MSR can create an opportunity for improvement.</li><li>• Some entities are no longer viable, but they have a Board of Directors and no one wants to take them on. Plus, small service districts don't have critical mass, nor resources to handle the future needs like water quality and to provide services efficiently.</li><li>• The County lacks a vision. They have not clearly defined what they do and how they do it. Lack of efficiency, this is why the OCBC has become so important; they fill the void left by the County (this comment and several similar ones about OCBC were not made by OCBC). The County also needs a broader vision for tourism.</li><li>• LAFCO needs to be able to play an aggressive role in eliminating or merging some of these obsolete districts.</li><li>• County Islands program needs to continue to eliminate the county islands. County of Orange is too slow on the implementation of this plan.</li><li>• All of the above: Maybe better education opportunities for public</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Cities and counties work closely with service providers</li><li>• Bring school districts together with all stakeholders on coordinated collaborative planning program (using SCORE—like process where appropriate compromises were evaluated)</li><li>• Coordination, collaboration and communications to develop a Master Plan: roles, lobbying for shared interests</li><li>• Increased cohesive, coordinated lobbying in Sacramento for local interests</li><li>• Decision on balance between quality of life and development – the nature of Orange County</li><li>• Chapman University could do Quality of Life conference</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Use Regional Transportation Plan as basis for more cooperation between cities and agencies</li><li>• Build Antonio Parkway to take pressure off the I-5</li><li>• Make regional transportation planning decisions that are truly regional</li><li>• Adopt a 50% vs. 2/3 requirement for infrastructure, schools and transportation votes</li><li>• Balanced, multi-purpose, comprehensive bond measures: transportation, open space, housing</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In contract cities – limited in ability to address regional needs</li><li>• Full-service cities: cooperative programs such as Irvine's Police Department sponsoring and managing after school programs</li><li>• Uniformity of and ability to address maintenance</li><li>• Address regional differences in Orange County</li><li>• Central area: address housing, jobs, transportation</li><li>• Coastal areas: consider land resources/meaning for region as a whole</li><li>• Use data</li><li>• Do long-term planning</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Think regionally (x)</li><li>• LAFCO review past consolidations to learn what worked and what didn't.</li><li>• Work together to provide the best services for the least cost</li><li>• Honest evaluations of ability to provide services</li><li>• Consolidate plans</li><li>• Consolidate - get rid of the islands and prevent more small cities from forming.</li><li>• State level needs to stop issuing mandates</li><li>• Better county leadership</li><li>• Urban water run-off education is needed</li></ul>

	City/County	Elected Officials	Influencers	Education	Environmental	Information Provider	Utility/Public Service
			<p>officials would help. Create unbiased program to train public officials on all major issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Other: “The Center for New Orange County” has been formed and is made up of: <b>County of Orange, Disney, OCTA, Fluor, O.C. Sanitation District, The Irvine Company</b></li><li>• Purposes: 1) How can they/we deal with County infrastructure, long term? 2) It is a 501c3 organization 3) It would be a long-term public/private partnership 4) They would also help to get new tax measures</li></ul>				
<b>Most Significant Issues: Urban Core</b> (Question 8A)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Open space and parks (xxxx)</li><li>• Sanitation (xx)</li><li>• Urban runoff (x)</li><li>• Workforce housing (x)</li><li>• Jobs/housing balance (x)</li><li>• Neighborhood preservation (x)</li><li>• Public safety</li><li>• Education and schools</li><li>• Deteriorating housing</li><li>• Transportation</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Transportation (xx)</li><li>• Education and schools (x)</li><li>• Distinction is north/south: urban core is in the north, urban fringe in the south.</li><li>• Many are problems for everyone but in different ways</li><li>• Water (all)</li><li>• Intergovernmental cooperation</li><li>• How SOI areas are absorbed and how pressures are dealt with</li><li>• Solid Waste</li><li>• Water supply</li><li>• Sanitation</li><li>• Adequacy of facilities for waste, water, sanitation</li><li>• Aging infrastructure</li><li>• Open space and parks</li><li>• Air Quality</li><li>• Runoff is coastal vs. inland</li><li>• Housing</li><li>• Public safety</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Transportation/traffic, sanitation, housing, education/schools, inter-governmental coordination on addressing these and other infrastructure issues.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Water housing, open space, transportation</li><li>• Air quality</li><li>• Open space, parks and recreation</li><li>• Water – all</li><li>• Urban runoff – all</li><li>• Sanitation – all</li><li>• Transportation – all (xx)</li><li>• Environmental – all</li><li>• Education – all</li><li>• Public safety -- all</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Problems for all: waste management, sanitation, open space, sprawl, housing, education and schools, growth, urban runoff, environmental</li><li>• Public safety: kids, drugs, gangs, education</li><li>• Housing – renew and renovate</li><li>• Parks – more needed</li><li>• Urban runoff</li><li>• Increased transit needs</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Both: Air quality, water, urban runoff, sanitation, waste management, fire, public safety, education and schools, housing, environmental and intergovernmental cooperation.</li><li>• County built out: urban sprawl not an issue</li><li>• Transportation in urban core</li><li>• Parks and open space – lack of space (x)</li><li>• Parks, Quality of Life impact on public safety</li><li>• Overcrowded housing –consider health implications</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Transportation (xxxxx)</li><li>• Urban water run-off (xxx)</li><li>• Affordable housing (xx)</li><li>• Sewer systems (x)</li><li>• Aging infrastructure (x)</li><li>• Waste Management (x)</li><li>• Public Safety/Police (x)</li><li>• Air quality (x)</li><li>• Intergovernmental cooperation</li><li>• Funding - Issues competing for the same customer dollars</li><li>• Water</li><li>• Schools</li><li>• Environmental justice</li><li>• Open space and parks</li><li>• Sprawl (while this is a problem for the urban core, the fringe is the cause of the problem.</li></ul>
<b>Most Significant Issues: Urban Fringe</b> (Question 8B)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Water (xxx)</li><li>• Transportation (xx)</li><li>• Infrastructure will have to be replaced all at once (xx)</li><li>• Sprawl (x)</li><li>• Lack of new schools (x)</li><li>• Affordable housing</li><li>• Urban sprawl</li><li>• Fire (South Co)</li><li>• Gypsum Canyon</li><li>• Over-capapcity landfills (all)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Urban Sprawl (xxx)</li><li>• Housing (both core and fringe) (xx)</li><li>• Environmental</li><li>• Open space</li><li>• Parks and recreation</li><li>• Water</li><li>• Traffic</li><li>• Urban runoff</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Will have problems with all items on the list, especially in housing and transportation, water, urban run-off, environmental issues. Some of these are more expensive housing areas, which might have quality of life issues as opposed to infrastructure issues.</li><li>• Higher density areas like Aliso Viejo will have crime and mass transportation issues.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Water, housing, open space, transportation</li><li>• Transportation and traffic</li><li>• Plenty of parks but access limited</li><li>• Affordable housing (most impact in fringe)</li><li>• Environmental impacts</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Fire, especially with building in forest and chaparral (xx)</li><li>• Fringe – all</li><li>• Air Quality and Water -- all</li><li>• Waste Management and Sanitation – all/ will require “exporting” trash/building more plants</li><li>• Open space and urban sprawl (big). Impacts habitat</li><li>• Different transportation strategies</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Both: Air quality, water, urban runoff, sanitation, waste management, fire, public safety, education and schools, housing, environmental and intergovernmental cooperation</li><li>• Coastal: land</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Transportation (x)</li><li>• Urban runoff (xx)</li><li>• Air quality (x)</li><li>• Water</li><li>• Waste Management</li><li>• Open space and parks</li><li>• Intergovernmental cooperation</li><li>• Funding - lack of planning</li><li>• No one is managing the growth and/or defining its ultimate impact</li></ul>

	City/County	Elected Officials	Influencers	Education	Environmental	Information Provider	Utility/Public Service
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Local financing</li><li>• Housing (everywhere)</li><li>• Schools ((everywhere)</li><li>• Air quality (everywhere)</li></ul>						
<b>Plan Effectiveness</b> (Question 8C)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Fire and public safety (xx)</li><li>• Providing for open space in South Orange County (x)</li><li>• Transportation. Inner urban joint planning—TMC, signals, arterials</li><li>• Increasing Riverside-Orange Route 91 cooperation</li><li>• Sprawl</li><li>• Intergovernmental cooperation</li><li>• Waste management</li><li>• Beginning to get a serious look: transportation, water quality, urban runoff</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Fire and emergency effective</li><li>• Public safety effective</li><li>• Open space, parks and recreation and water well planned for. Barriers include resources and intergovernmental cooperation</li><li>• Sanitation and waste management effective</li><li>• Air quality great gains</li><li>• Attention to sprawl but real solutions lacking</li><li>• Lack of participation, NIMBYism and shifting of problems to others are barriers</li><li>• Lack of funding for large public works projects</li><li>• No long-term strategic plan for facilities</li><li>• Dealing with outfall of sewage treatment issues are a band-aid: long term, systemic solution needed</li><li>• Transportation not keeping up with development</li><li>• Talk about higher density but not much is happening</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Most thought agencies were doing a good job with fire, public safety, and the acquisition and dedication of open space.</li><li>• Some thought they were doing pretty good with air quality, environmental, some of the traffic/transportation issues, conserving, maximizing, and re-using water, solid waste management (land fills &amp; trash pick-up, etc.).</li><li>• Misc: Capo School District is doing a good job.</li><li>• Transportation is a political issue not an infrastructure issue.</li><li>• Obstacles: Public funding, provincialism – each politician being concerned only about what is inside his borders, jurisdictional squabbles, financial resources, lack of leadership.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Don't know – need to trust public servants to shepherd our needs</li><li>• Not enough parks to go around in Urban Core; plenty of parks but access limited in urban fringe</li><li>• Question on what will happen when Rancho Mission Viejo built</li><li>• Public safety, police, fire and education are planned for</li><li>• Urban runoff leading to partnering among cities, businesses and environmental groups</li><li>• Barrier: Legislative mandates with Northern California bias</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Plans for where to get water are unrealistic: “pie in the sky”</li><li>• Public safety planning is well in hand</li><li>• No plans for affordable housing</li><li>• Runoff awareness vis a vis tourism is growing (clean beaches)</li><li>• Species in Santa Ana Mountains not being preserved</li><li>• Open space set-asides not adhered to</li><li>• Implementation of other Plans (e.g. SCORE) depends on political will</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Maintenance not adequately planned for</li><li>• Transportation and traffic – transportation agencies think they're effective but building more freeways is not the answer</li><li>• Governor isn't an example of effective planning – without a budget can't do long-term planning at state or local levels.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Police services</li><li>• Air quality</li><li>• Water</li><li>• Obstacle: don't want to convey bad news to the public.</li><li>• Demarcation between North County and South County seems to be disappearing</li></ul>
<b>Leadership Roles and Partnerships: County</b> (Question 10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• (Limited to) Social Services: Health, welfare, justice, jails (xxxx)</li><li>• Yes –multi-jurisdictional projects such as Rancho Mission Viejo (x)</li><li>• Urban Runoff – impaired water body cleanup</li><li>• Housing information and expertise</li><li>• Get County out of issues such as transportation</li><li>• County get out of the way</li><li>• “Lead, follow or get out of the way”</li><li>• COG a better forum for health/welfare issues</li><li>• Providing regional parks</li><li>• County allows sprawl to occur in unincorporated areas</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Yes, although compromised in bankruptcy.</li><li>• Yes but doubt they can assume it. El Toro example of lack of unification</li><li>• Limited role. Minimize role, clarify authority</li><li>• Sheriff Corona and other County services increased confidence</li><li>• County Planning Department should get out of the way, especially on SOI</li><li>• County is a partner in several issues (South OC)</li><li>• Rancho Mission Viejo a model of collaborative planning – early consideration of governance</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Wide range of answers on this one: Most thought the County should play a leadership role, but were skeptical about them being able to do so successfully. They felt this way because the they thought the County officials/leaders had “demonstrated that they (elected officials and staff) can't do it,” do does not appear to have the leadership in place not appear to have the leadership in place (Tom Wilson and Campbell were stated as exceptions), and the leaders were thought to possibly be unwilling to take on the responsibility.</li><li>• Interviewees thought ideally the County leaders should and could be the leader in addressing these</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• County focus on “servant leadership”</li><li>• County as “listener”</li><li>• County has a role as others do – not significant or special</li><li>• Through Board of Supervisors planning mandates and directions to planning staff – encourage early participation and cooperation with school districts</li><li>• Protect school sites from development until money can be found to build facilities</li><li>• Encourage universal design/flexibility in school site preservation and development</li><li>• Encourage more joint use facilities</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Of course. RMV is a good example of how County can exert its designated leadership role</li><li>• County must be leader – individual cities can't</li><li>• Get out of the development business.</li><li>• Be stewards of the rural landscape in rural areas</li><li>• Continue to provide health and welfare services</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Yes, but has rarely done so.</li><li>• Tom Wilson's efforts are a model of bringing stakeholders together</li><li>• Lack of accountability on the Board but community expectations high</li><li>• Of course – provide a lot of it: health, parks, waste management</li><li>• Cities need to consider County as their seat of government</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Should take an active role (xxxx), but they haven't.</li><li>• County doesn't carry as much weight since there are less people living in unincorporated areas. (x)</li><li>• Should be heavily involved in regulatory issues.</li><li>• Overlapping functions need to be addressed to determine if stand-alone or consolidated is more suitable.</li><li>• Due to conflicts of interest, the County government couldn't step in and provide leadership without major changes.</li><li>• One good thing that came out of El Toro land issue was that it made the County &amp; various South County Cities listened to each other.</li></ul>



	City/County	Elected Officials	Influencers	Education	Environmental	Information Provider	Utility/Public Service
			regional issues because they are the next level higher (than local agencies) and are the logical entity to address regional issues. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Also, they have the largest shared boundary between the neighboring counties.</li><li>• One suggestion was to go to a “county-mayor” type of government.</li><li>• Also, too little investment in economic development.</li></ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Continue to have funding problems</li></ul>
<b>Leadership Roles and Partnerships: Local Agencies/Cities</b> (Question 9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Consideration of how land use decisions affect others</li><li>• Work together to address affordable housing</li><li>• Long-term planning</li><li>• Work in cooperation for subregional resolution of issues</li><li>• Leadership important to buy-in</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• See selves as good faith procurers of services and necessary supplies</li><li>• Achieve economies of scale to ensure necessary, timely and regular supply of services at reasonable cost</li><li>• Open to cooperating and forming large buying groups (economy of scale) – starting in the North</li><li>• Be informed and work with other cities</li><li>• Cities are service developers for residents and need to work with each other, sharing lessons learned and ideas</li><li>• Cities should take the lead</li><li>• Yes, especially developed, full-service cities</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• All felt that it is very important, if not critical for the agencies to be working together in partnership.</li><li>• COG isn’t working, too much theorizing and not enough action.</li><li>• “Phenomenally important, but don’t see a vehicle to make that happen, partially because people don’t understand their municipal diversity. One agency (like a city) doesn’t provide a wide range of services (water, sewer, fire) because local agencies are handled by an independent group, thus they operate autonomously.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Occurs city-by-city</li><li>• Provide guidance and wisdom</li><li>• Work cooperatively</li><li>• Be global thinkers and willing to compromise</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Cities have critical leadership role</li><li>• City with a vision can play a leadership role – Irvine with the Great Park</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Focus more on service provision than land use regulation</li><li>• More alignment with special districts and cities, allowing joint facilities planning</li><li>• Obligation to listen and plan long-term, taking an active role with County government</li><li>• Have a long-term vision. Can’t expect this from citizens.</li><li>• Determine how and where growth occurs not “look what happened to us” as in Santa Ana.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Essential (xxxxxx)</li><li>• Partnerships should be made rather than consolidations</li><li>• Asset management</li><li>• Community support</li><li>• “We simply cannot do it”</li><li>• LAFCO should say “you can incorporate but you have to share law enforcement and can’t have a water board until you have population of 200,000.”</li><li>• Long term gains are not considered (term limits hinder this)</li></ul>
<b>Leadership Roles and Partnerships: Special Districts</b> (Question 11)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Situational leadership depending on issue</li><li>• Orange County Fire Authority positive example (xx)</li><li>• OCTA model – working with adjacent cities and subregions on solutions</li><li>• Be willing to consolidate and re-consider boundaries</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Success of OCTA as special district for transportation – cities at table, balance cost/benefit</li><li>• Transportation agencies can assert leadership roles</li><li>• Difficult – focused on singular issue; leadership difficult beyond a single issue</li><li>• Best with elected &amp; citizen officials on boards</li><li>• Be less arrogant and heavy-handed</li><li>• Be less parochial and more objective</li><li>• Increase openness to grassroots leadership efforts and looking at duplication of costs, overhead, increasing efficiency while maintaining local control</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Limited - it should be in cooperation with the County. Special districts are more self-serving. Difficult to be leaders on regional issues. Possible conflict of interest, although they should have a heightened sense of civic responsibility to the region as a whole.</li><li>• The special districts are single minded and just focused on their own area. They want to stay out of the limelight and out of public focus. Don’t want political involvement.</li><li>• There are no significant leadership roles (COG notwithstanding) being handled by cities or special districts.</li><li>• League of Cities doesn’t have a</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Provide guidance and wisdom</li><li>• Work cooperatively</li><li>• Be global thinkers and willing to compromise</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proliferation of water districts should be looked at</li><li>• South Orange County Traffic Integrated an example of leadership/cooperation among OCTA, Caltrans, Feds. Impact on open space/habitat uncertain</li><li>• Special districts are “hidden government”, not accountable</li><li>• Some are doing good – ground water recharge</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• More alignment between special districts and cities</li><li>• No comments</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Should work together to determine regional solutions (x)</li><li>• Agencies should take a business approach to management.</li><li>• Should share technical insight &amp; make shared decisions through a collaborative process.</li><li>• Institutional arrangements should be made for dialog.</li><li>• Everyone needs to participate to fashion inter-jurisdictional solutions.</li><li>• Provide the best services for the least cost</li><li>• Currently, there is a natural distrust.</li><li>• Respond to who elects them</li></ul>

	City/County	Elected Officials	Influencers	Education	Environmental	Information Provider	Utility/Public Service
			<p>truly regional perspective, but rather a municipal/local perspective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>One person said that they thought OCTA was doing a good job at taking a strategic approach and implementing regional and sub-regional solutions.</li></ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Protecting the needs of the cities</li></ul>
<b>LAFCO Actions</b> (Questions 14 & 15)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Forum for discussing regional issues, solutions, cooperation (xxx)</li><li>Orange County Leadership Symposium (OCLS)</li><li>Leadership on jobs/housing balance discussion</li><li>Leadership on affordable housing issue</li><li>Act as low-key convener</li><li>Raise issues cities won't do alone (service sharing/consolidation)</li><li>Advocate for maximum local flexibility in service provision</li><li>Citizen education</li><li>Policymaker education (white papers)</li><li>Provide factual, data-based reports without political bias.</li><li>Set up generic model for problem-solving</li><li>Education on fiscal realities</li><li>LAFCO misunderstood – not a regional forum</li><li>No role beyond annexations – increases layers/bureaucracy</li><li>Keep official role – annexations, Community Service Districts</li><li>Increase amount of local control over SOI areas (xxxx)</li><li>Prevent another Coto de Caza</li><li>Influence to create contiguous open space – especially hillside (xx)</li><li>Rate restructuring</li><li>Consider consolidating district or joint use partnership agreements</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Continue leadership meetings (e.g., OCLS)</li><li>Inspire collaborative approach by bringing key parties and decision-makers together to look at all facets of solutions</li><li>Allow time for problem assessment by all before jumping to solution</li><li>Serve as lead agency for politically difficult issues. Landfills; population growth/immigration impacts, positives of density, benefits of mass transportation</li><li>Get inland cities to understand that runoff is their issue as well</li><li>Give cities direct role in SOI</li><li>Make sure no new county islands are developed and created outside city boundaries that cities are subsequently required to “adopt”</li><li>More proactive in brokering hillside development</li><li>Follow through once land within SOI is determined</li><li>More assertive with SOIs – aggressive on annexations</li><li>Address governance for newly-developing areas as early as possible</li><li>Do in-depth review of how JPAs can increase local government efficiency</li><li>Proactive in government realignment and restructuring.</li><li>Address consolidation of cities</li><li>Address disbanding of County government, reduction of County services or dissemination of services from County government to special districts</li><li>Look at ways to improve</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Some thought that LAFCO could be a good mediator, but may not have enough authority to make decisions or be strong leaders. They need to be willing and/or able to punish cities/agencies for making poor decisions, like not annexing a property/project when they should, etc.</li><li>They could disseminate information and raise the overall level of enlightenment and education among agencies, their staff and their officials, as well as the public as a whole.</li><li>Clearly, the service reviews can deal with assessing the feasibility and validity of special districts and even certain cities. They can flush the issues out, force sensitive issues to be discussed and debated, then at the end of the day, vote on them and make a decision.</li><li>LAFCO's annexation role is important.</li><li>LAFCO should focus its energy on consolidating various agencies and reducing the amount of crossover regulation. Water districts were an example.</li></ul> <p><b>Specific Issues For LAFCO To Raise (listed all)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The plethora of water districts should be consolidated in to fewer &amp; larger districts.</li><li>Everyone wants good water quality - which is good, but the requirements are ridiculous. There should be regional requirements for urban water quality and storm water runoff, not ridiculous requirements on every site.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Some type of coordinating role</li><li>“Leave your politics at the door” session with good, honest dialogue with mutual respect on tough issues</li><li>The one agency that doesn't have a special interest and can act as an impartial party</li><li>LAFCO focus others in County on need for coordinated, consolidated effort – not “going it alone”</li><li>Convene stakeholders (x)</li><li>Input for school districts on development of SOI/input in facilities needs</li><li>Coordination and information sharing</li><li>Help streamline the environmental process</li><li>Encourage coordination with water districts and plans for use of reclaimed water</li><li>Address “interagency abuse” where one agency requires another to pay for infrastructure costs that it incurred</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Denominate the financial implications of working together vs. fragmentation – cost-effectiveness of coordination</li><li>Don't understand workings of LAFCO</li><li>Have discretion and authority to stop development in the first place – not just refuse incorporation after the damage is done. Probably not in charter.</li><li>Require making use of existing inventory of vacant, developer land before annexing rural areas. Have a properly functioning infill plan before annexing unincorporated areas</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>LAFCO as convener and facilitator (x)</li><li>Matchmaker between services and resources (encourage city/agency collaboratives for sharing of specialties and strengths)</li><li>Assist cities/agencies to look outside their “box” – cities don't have the time</li><li>LAFCO in best position to do capacity building within agencies</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Initiate respectful, open dialog between agencies (x)</li><li>Help through annexation process.</li><li>Annexation and incorporation</li><li>Determination of jurisdictional boundaries.</li><li>Encourage “entrepreneurial” ideas in public agency employees</li><li>LAFCO should be a model others can follow</li><li>Comprehensive study of water resources, from the time it enters the County until it leaves the County to provide a well-rounded solution.</li><li>More personal relationship with agencies and constituents</li><li>Support SB 55 (No money, no mandates)</li><li>City payback to the County for services provided before incorporation.</li><li>Don't just tell me what to do, help me get it done.</li></ul>

	City/County	Elected Officials	Influencers	Education	Environmental	Information Provider	Utility/Public Service
		<p>efficiency – e.g. number of water districts: duplication of costs, overhead? Efficiency vs. local control?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Explain what LAFCO does and orient new Council. Educate on use of LAFCO as a resource</li><li>• Serve as a resource to communities</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LAFCO needs to raise a “red flag” when misinformation is being spread. (Like beaches being closed due to construction water run-off isn’t true)</li><li>• LAFCO needs to be well received</li><li>• Dissolution or consolidation of existing agencies.</li><li>• Review efficiency (fiscal) of services being provided.</li><li>• On-going collaboration should be a continual priority.</li><li>• LAFCO could help create and enforce accountability among agencies and associations.</li><li>• Maybe LAFCO could address asset management. What do you have and how do you take care of it? (i.e. road repair)</li><li>• Lead the effort in recognizing the aging population and become an advocate for the appropriate services. Mental health and health services in general are lacking, and the consolidation of services might be a solution.</li></ul>				
<b>Ideas and Models</b> (Questions 13 & 16)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• San Diego took a coordinated approach to schools, housing and open space</li><li>• LA School District joint schools/parks use</li><li>• Silicon Valley Manufacturers Group investment in affordable housing</li><li>• Orange County Fire Authority JPA (xx)</li><li>• RMV/SCORE process (xxx)</li><li>• 800-Megahertz system (xx)</li><li>• OC Bankruptcy recovery plan</li><li>• OC COG could be future leadership model</li><li>• GMA Process</li><li>• County/Dana Point effort on Harbor reconstruction</li><li>• El Toro Airport opposition</li><li>• Brea-Yorba Linda law enforcement cooperation</li><li>• OCTA working with cities</li><li>• Take a systemic approach to urban runoff: source of problem,</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Indianapolis model – city/county merger for economies of scale</li><li>• Portland, Oregon’s rational planning Model</li><li>• Harris County Texas model</li><li>• SANDAG (San Diego Association of Governments)</li><li>• Maintain uniqueness of Orange County</li><li>• Equity of service delivery needed: north county not subsidize south county for services not needed in the north</li><li>• OCTA is a positive model for other County efforts</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• One person thought Smart Growth should be redefined as a process rather than an end product. The process should be one of educating the populous as well as civic leaders on the nature and inevitability of growth. Second, it should be a process that encourages communication across political and jurisdictional boundaries. This would be a great 1<sup>st</sup> step.</li><li>• Orange County Business Council was thought to be doing a really good job with their efforts. Report card etc.</li><li>• Cleveland has a good model in the way they rebuilt themselves with an unusual level of cooperation among all levels of local and state government with strong support from the private sector and population.</li><li>• This was sparked/initiated by the private sector leadership. There</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• BART and mass transit</li><li>• Chicago for rail and mass transit</li><li>• Learn from other areas with too many people and water problems</li><li>• Increased joint use facilities between schools and cities, parks and recreation and libraries</li><li>• Federal, State and County offices sharing one central facility</li><li>• Improved inter-county cooperation with regard to childcare services</li><li>• The SCORE process—a model for all development, bringing together a wider variety of stakeholders early in the process</li><li>• None come immediately to mind</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Portland, Oregon –elected regional government</li><li>• Sweden – urban growth boundaries protect agricultural land and tall apartment buildings surrounded by parks</li><li>• Require every new industrial park to develop sufficient housing for workers employed there</li><li>• SCORE process a good example of how things should be done (if plan is fulfilled)</li><li>• Rancho Mission Viejo/SCORE coming up with good things: housing/open space preservation; senior assisted living; commercial/industrial park</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• South County community cohesion in opposition to El Toro Airport led to ability to define responsibilities for other joint ventures and issues such as youth programs and housing</li><li>• Home-Aid Program sponsored by homebuilders to provide for transitional housing</li><li>• Health Funders Partnership – sets aside own issues, chooses health topics, acts as a funding collaborative, pooling resources</li><li>• Certified Application Assistors – come together to share resources rather than each agency acting alone</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Agreements for sewer maintenance within O.C. (x) Quality people are more necessary than any model.</li><li>• New England style of government - shared governance. All stakeholders come together to openly discuss their viewpoints. The group should address the issues until all sides have been discussed and a consensus is reached. No votes are taken. It is the power of ideas. By gathering in the same room, great opportunities would be discovered. Local ideas would be shared by the group.</li><li>• San Diego - the MOP overlaps County government.</li><li>• OCTAP (Orange County Taxi Administration Program)</li></ul>

	City/County	Elected Officials	Influencers	Education	Environmental	Information Provider	Utility/Public Service
	public education, rate restructuring <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Sewer and water district leadership in urban runoff</li><li>• Consolidations using Community Service District powers and/or Joint Powers Authorities – South Orange County Street Sweeping Authority</li></ul>		was a broad array of solutions, a major renovation, and a major rebuilding effort. ULI took a tour and has more information on it. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• State of Maryland did a rational job achieving coordination between government agencies, especially in transportation.</li><li>• There are some JPAs that work well.</li><li>• Fire Authority – 24 board members, seems to work pretty well.</li><li>• If jurisdictional agencies are given incentives to work together (or penalized if they don't) then they are more likely to work together successfully.</li><li>• Possibly urban run-off is a good example, even though it's not perfect.</li><li>• Often the process is the most important to build consensus and at least achieve some of each person's goal.</li><li>• California Center for Regional Leadership is pretty good.</li><li>• Local Government Commission is also pretty good.</li><li>• One person believes SCAG is a regional detriment to cooperation and collaboration because people assume they are handling issues, but they aren't. So issues don't get addressed. I.e. 91 Freeway - they didn't get involved like they should.</li></ul>				